DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 895 EA 009 705

AUTHOR Collister, Larry
TITLE The Dual Principalship: An Experiment at Sand Point and Cedar Park Schools, 1976-1977. Report No. 77-5.
INSTITUTION Seattle Public Schools, Wash. Dept. of Management Information Services.
PUB DATE Mar 77
NOTE 40p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Responsibility; *Experimental Programs; Parent Attitudes; *Principals; Program Costs; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; School Surveys; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Dual Principalship; *Seattle Public Schools WA

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the results of an opinion poll given to a sample of parents, parent association board members, staff, and the principal at Cedar Park and Sand Point schools where the dual principalship experiment has been under way since September 1976. The data provided by this limited experiment do not justify a conclusion that the dual principalship is unfeasible or, for that matter, that the experiment should be established on a wider basis. Opinions given in the polls suggest that the principal in the experiment has overcome a number of difficulties in making the dual principalship successful at Sand Point-Cedar Park. The responsibilities of the principalship in two schools are far beyond those expected of one principal in a single building. One may expect the role of the principal to change dramatically over time if the dual principalship is to become a permanent feature of the administration of the Seattle schools. Appendixes contain questionnaires, responses, and an evaluation of the program prepared by the principal in the experiment. (Author/IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED141895

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE DUAL PRINCIPALSHIP: AN EXPERIMENT AT SAND POINT AND CEDAR PARK SCHOOLS 1976-1977

REPORT NO. 77-5
MARCH, 1977

LARRY COLLISTER

Department of
Management Information Services

SEATTLE
PUBLIC
SCHOOLS

EA 009 705

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Administrative and Service Center
815 Fourth Avenue North
Seattle, Washington 98109

THE DUAL PRINCIPALSHIP: AN EXPERIMENT AT SAND POINT AND CEDAR PARK SCHOOLS 1976-1977

REPORT NO. 77-5
MARCH, 1977

LARRY COLLISTER

MANAGEMENT SERVICES DIVISION
Robert L. Nelson
Assistant Superintendent

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SERVICES
Susan Stier, Coordinator

Prepared by:

Larry Collister

Larry Collister, Supervisor
Research Office

Approved by:

Susan Stier

Susan Stier, Coordinator
Management Information Services

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the results of an opinion poll given to a sample of parents, to PTSA Board members, to staff and to principals at Cedar Park and Sand Point where the dual principalship experiment has been underway since September, 1976. The data provided by this limited experiment do not justify a conclusion that the dual principalship is unfeasible, or, for that matter, that it should be established on a wider basis.

Opinions given in the polls suggest that Principal Jim Alexander has overcome a number of difficulties in making the dual principalship successful at Sand Point-Cedar Park this year. The responsibilities of the principalship in two schools are far beyond those expected of one principal in a single building. One may expect the role of the principal to change dramatically over time if the dual principalship is to become a permanent feature of the administration of the Seattle Schools.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PRESENTATION OF THE DATA	3
RETURNS	3
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	3
FINDINGS: STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE	3
FINDINGS: PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE	4
FINDINGS: INTERVIEW WITH PRINCIPAL	5
FINDINGS: COST SAVINGS	6
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	9
THE DUAL PRINCIPALSHIP: OUTCOMES TO BE ANTICIPATED	9
UNANTICIPATED OUTCOMES	11
APPENDICES	13-38
I - STAFF SURVEY	13
II - RESPONSES, STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE	17
III - LETTER TO PARENT	23
PARENT SURVEY	25
IV - RESPONSES, PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE	27
V - EVALUATION OF THE DUAL PRINCIPALSHIP PREPARED BY JIM ALEXANDER, PRINCIPAL	33

INTRODUCTION

In March 1976, the Seattle School Board directed that two schools be placed under the leadership of one principal, for the school year 1976-77. This arrangement, called the Dual Principalship, was to be established in two pairs of elementary schools. The Board further directed that a Teaching Principalship be established in two other schools. In this arrangement, the Principal of a school would have half time teaching responsibilities.

Purpose

The purpose of this action was part of the Board's long range response to the problems of declining enrollment and dwindling fiscal resources. The Board wanted an empirical basis for future decisions. In providing this direction, several Board members stated that they understood the limitations of this "experiment"; that the results could not be conclusive, but that it would at least provide some experience with each of the proposed administrative arrangements. The purpose of this document is to present the findings of a Research Office Study that has evaluated this experience.

Schools Selected for the Experiment

One school, West Queen Anne, was designated as the site for a Teaching Principalship. Rainier View and Emerson schools were paired under the leadership of Jack Rollo in the Dual Principal role, while Cedar Park and Sand Point were paired under the direction of Principal Jim Alexander.

Parents at West Queen Anne, Rainier View, and Emerson reacted swiftly to the proposals, voicing strong opposition. The Teaching Principalship at West Queen Anne was withdrawn after only a few days, and the Dual Principalship at Rainier View and Emerson was withdrawn several weeks after the opening of the 1976-77 school year. The only schools remaining under a new administrative arrangement were Sand Point and Cedar Park. Parents at these schools had also expressed displeasure with the experiment, but were willing to accept it on a trial basis as an alternative to school closure.

Design of the Study

Questions. Two questions were to be answered by the study: (1) do staff, parents, and the principal involved perceive the new administrative arrangement as helpful to the educational process? and (2) what cost

savings were realized as a result of this type of administrative arrangement?

Data gathering techniques used to answer these questions are discussed in the sections which immediately follow on (1) Outcomes and (2) Expenditures.

(1) Outcomes as Perceived by Staff, Parents, and Principal. A questionnaire was developed to measure attitudes in general areas of concern. These general areas were the outcomes of school programs, the general operation of the school, the health of the principal, and the morale and attitude of the staff. Questions were included in the survey relating to student discipline.

The questionnaire was administered to the staff at both schools. Parents responded to another questionnaire. A random sample of 100 parents from Sand Point and 100 parents from Cedar Park were given the mailed questionnaire. In addition, PTSA Board members were given copies of the questionnaire, and these were separately identified. Both instruments are included in the Appendix.

An effort was made to identify work activities devolving on the principal and secretaries which appeared to be a result of the dual principalship. Interviews were held with the Principal early in the school year, and again in February to assess the results. A tentative agreement had been made that principal and secretaries might keep a daily log, entering examples of activities which seemed different from previous experience because of the dual principalship. In practice, this turned out to be unfeasible, since the components of daily activity were not usually identifiable as "caused" by the new administrative arrangement.

In February, Jim Alexander, Principal, prepared a report of his experiences in which he states his evaluation of the Dual Principalship. His report is included in the Appendix.

(2) Expenditures. It was proposed that school expenditures be examined to compare expenditure categories which might be directly affected by the change in administrative structure. The only category (except salaries) where spending could be attributed to the dual principalship was that of mileage costs.

Other expenditure costs or savings were not analyzed. Because of the interaction of other factors such as inflation, after-effects of the levy loss, and the like, it was not possible to attribute changes in costs for other budget areas to the change in organization of the two schools. However, in the section on conclusions and recommendations, some subjective judgments about costs will be included.

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

Returns

Twelve staff members (86%) returned the questionnaire from Cedar Park and eight staff members (50%) returned the questionnaire from Sand Point. The principal responded on a separate questionnaire for each school.

Twenty-nine parents (29%) responded from Cedar Park, and thirty-nine parents (39%) responded from Sand Point. Six returns were received from Cedar Park PTSA Board members, and thirteen returns were received from Sand Point PTSA Board members.

Limitations of the Study

The reader is urged to use great caution in interpreting the data. The number of schools involved in the experiment and the small number of returns received, do not make it possible to generalize the results to all schools, or to generalize the opinions recorded as representative of the populations to whom they were addressed. The data presented in this report do not argue compellingly either in favor of or in opposition to the dual principalship.

It is believed, however, that the participants have given their thoughtful consideration to the questions of the study, and their views should be considered in any decisions relating to the possible implementation of the dual principalship in the future.

Findings: Staff Questionnaire

Significant observations found in staff responses were:

- Staff members generally do not believe students have caused more disruptions this year than last year because of the dual principalship.
- Staff members and principal believe students experience more delay in receiving disciplinary attention.
- Staff members and principal believe the principal is showing more visible signs of fatigue than a year ago.
- The secretary's role in student discipline has increased.

- The teacher's role in discipline followup has increased.
- The playground and lunchroom are adequately supervised. (This is done by classified personnel.)
- Teachers and other staff may not know "who is responsible for the building" in the principal's absence.
- Eighty percent of staff members would prefer the dual principalship to school closure, if given no other alternative.

All of the responses from staff members are tabulated in Appendix II, (pg. 17).

Findings: Parent Questionnaire

The staff questionnaire was sent to a random sample of 100 parents at each school, and given to PTSA Board members at each school. Since PTSA Board members are in close contact with the school, one may assume that their knowledge of actual conditions in the school is more accurate than the knowledge of parents selected randomly.

In this discussion, the term "parents" means the respondents from the random sample of parents, while "board" means PTSA Board members who responded to the survey.

As was done with the staff survey, "agree" and "strongly agree" responses have been combined, and "disagree" and "strongly disagree" have been combined. The general findings are given here. Open comments given by parents and Board members are given in the following section.

- Parents at Cedar Park feel that students are experiencing delay in receiving disciplinary attention. However, the Cedar Park Board is divided on this question, as are both the Board and parents at Sand Point.
- The Sand Point Board and parents agree that the principal is showing signs of fatigue and strain.
- More than 75% of all respondents felt they have ample opportunity to discuss problems with the principal, although the Sand Point Board was divided on this question.
- More than 90% of the respondents agree that the playground and lunchroom are adequately supervised.
- Thirty percent of the respondents believe staff morale has been impaired.
- More than 95% of the respondents believe the staff understands who is responsible for the building in the principal's absence.

- Thirty percent agree that the instructional program has been seriously affected.

- More than 90% of all respondents would prefer the dual principalship to closure, given no other alternative.

Responses to the items of the parent questionnaire are given in Appendix IV, (pg. 27).

Findings: Interview with Principal

Comments from parents indicate their awareness of the special role the principal plays in the school. He is an educational leader to the teaching faculty. He is a friend and counselor to students. He is the key link between the school and its surrounding community. He facilitates the development of good relationships between parents and teachers. He is responsible for the administration of the educational program. He is responsible for the health and safety of both staff and students, insofar as these are affected by the school operation.

The indications which this writer has seen point to an exceptional achievement this year by Jim Alexander in his role as Principal at Sand Point and at Cedar Park. Mr. Alexander, however, does not express complete satisfaction with what he himself has accomplished. When asked whether his health is a factor, he replied that his blood pressure is up slightly. He indicated that he is under a continuing mental strain. He expressed concern that he might be making judgment errors under pressures of time. He stated that he more frequently views things somewhat negatively than last year, and that his self image is lowered. He said he feels "less success" this year. Mr. Alexander stated that he has more difficulty instantaneously prioritizing the use of his time. The need to "see this child" is often urgent, either to praise, to encourage, or to correct a child, but the need is always there. Alexander mentioned that sleep has become somewhat of a problem for him; he experiences much more anxiety today than a year ago.

He mentioned his relationship to the District's central administration. Goals and expectations from central administrators have increased this year for all building principals. For the Principal at Sandpoint-Cedar Park, this expectation has nearly doubled. He expressed appreciation for the understanding and helpfulness of the Area Administrators who supervised the Roosevelt and Hale consortiums.

Parents and staff from both schools have been very understanding, he stated. Mr. Alexander indicated, however, some disappointment that he has not been able to give as much attention to parent groups as he would prefer. Since physical differences between the two buildings present different problems in the operation of the schools, it has not been profitable to hold joint meetings of the two building staffs. Similar reasons make joint PTSA meetings generally inadvisable. These conditions make it difficult to exercise economies of time that, at first glance, might appear to be useful.

Findings: Cost Savings

Some savings in cost were realized by utilizing the services of one principal where two would otherwise have been required. When the Facilities Utilization Study team addressed this question in relation to school closure, the following rationale was used:

> "When an elementary school is closed there is one less principal. This does not mean, though, that the cost saving amounts to the annual salary of one principal. The scenario usually goes like this: the displaced principal becomes a very well paid teacher in some other school and an inexperienced teacher becomes expendable in order to maintain the same pupil-teacher ratio. Consequently, a more realistic cost saving estimate would be equivalent to an average teacher salary plus benefits."[1]

The 1976-77 average teacher salary and benefits were $18,741. Presumably, then, this amount was saved in the present experiment.

Dollar costs to be assessed against this were those attributable to increased mileage. The accounting office summarized the principal's mileage expenses for the two schools for comparable time periods as given below.

	Cedar Park	Sand Point
September 1, 1975 to February 1, 1976	-0-	$45.89
September 1, 1976 to February 1, 1977	$81.96	$81.95

The amounts indicated are nominal. The travel expense in dollars (not measured in time), allowing for differences in mileage rates (12¢ per mile in 1975-76; 15¢ per mile in 1976-77), one may conclude that Sand Point's actual mileage increased by 40% due to the dual principalship.

Two clerks were hired on a part-time basis, to assist the secretaries in handling some of their load. During 1976-77, costs incurred by the District for clerical support were $7,990.

The principal's extra time was donated. He reported that the length of his working day has steadily increased as the year has advanced. Early in the year he reports 9.5 hour days. By January this had increased to 10 or 10.5 hours, and in February this was running between 10 and 11 hours. He expects to use seven extra contract days before the current year ends.

The school secretaries were not given an extra stipend, although their responsibilities increased. Often the secretaries found themselves in the

---

[1] Interview, Gary Beanblossom, Facilities Utilization Study Director, February 28, 1977.

role of instant decision maker. Although remuneration and job functions are inseparably linked, further discussion on changes in job roles will be included in the section on Conclusions and Recommendations.

A summary of all costs/savings attributable to the Dual Principal experiment is given here:

A. Savings	
Salary[2]	$18,741.00
B. Additional Costs	
Seven contract days (approx.)[3]	$ 700.00
Clerical Support	7,990.00
Mileage	118.00
Total Added Costs	$ 8,808.00
Net Savings (A - B)	$ 9,933.00

[2] See discussion, p. 6, ¶ 2

[3] See discussion, p. 6, ¶ 6

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Because of limitations of the scope of the experiment already mentioned (see pg. 3), this paper will not state a recommendation firmly in favor of or in opposition to the establishment of dual principalships in other schools of Seattle in coming years. However, the experience points to two important conclusions:

- It is possible for two schools to be administered by one principal. Parents seem fairly well satisfied with the outcome, but they qualify their approval with the remark that this principal, Jim Alexander, is unusually dedicated, and some express the view that it might not work so well in other situations. Parents also indicated their understanding of the need to minimize costs, and generally express their approval subject to the qualification that school closure as an alternative is unacceptable.

- The role of the principal will change over time if the dual principalship becomes a permanent feature of the School District organization.

In the following section, some of the role changes which probably would occur if the dual principalship were to be established on a broad basis in the Seattle Schools will be discussed.

The Dual Principalship: Outcomes to be Anticipated

As previously stated, the Sand Point-Cedar Park experience has established that the dual principalship is a feasible method of administering two schools. Although the data from this study do not justify a recommendation favoring or opposing the establishment of dual principalships elsewhere in the Seattle Schools, the experience at Sand Point-Cedar Park does suggest important areas for consideration in future decisions. In particular, one may anticipate that the role of the principal will probably change over time if the dual principalship becomes a permanent feature of the School District organization. It is intended here to discuss some of the role changes which probably would occur if the dual principalship were to be established on a broad basis in the Seattle Schools.

This discussion begins with the premise that the success of the dual principalship at Sand Point-Cedar Park was due in large measure to the

dedication of an unusually conscientious principal. Although demands on his time have increased as the school year advanced, he has been unwilling to give less than what each situation has required. In a similar manner, the attention given by the school secretaries has been remarkable. Both women have given their very best efforts to make the job easier for the principal, and to solve problems in an effective manner.

A second premise is that the duties of principal and secretaries have been burdensome. Many of the problems encountered have been forthrightly addressed by Principal Jim Alexander in his report, contained in the appendix to this paper, (pg. 33).

A third premise is that the combination of skills and dedication to duty found in the key people at Sand Point-Cedar Park may not be available on an extended basis to implement the dual principalship throughout the School District.

A consequence of these premises is that the principalship itself would change substantially under an extended dual principalship. Two changes may be expected. One has to do with the financial compensation principal and secretaries receive for added responsibilities and time required; the other relates to methods which would have to be adopted to fit the principal's duties into a reasonable work day.

It is clear to this writer that principals and secretaries will have to receive an appropriate stipend if they are expected to assume duties not considered a part of the regular job assignment. The Sand Point-Cedar Park experience should be a sufficient basis to establish that principals and secretaries operating in the dual principal environment must assume duties beyond those traditionally assigned to either role.

Limitations of time will demand that the role itself be streamlined, made more "efficient" (i.e., to consume less time). Some of the ways by which this "streamlining" might occur are the following:

- Reduce communications with line administration to a bare minimum. This would require important changes in the amount and detail required in the completion of various forms and information gathering devices used by central administration.
- Remove or modify playground responsibilities.
- Modify responsibilities for student discipline.
- Eliminate or reduce paper drives, carnivals, talent shows, international dinners, and other activities which promote school spirit and parent participation.
- Reduce time required for PTSA and community relations.

Unanticipated Outcomes

The foregoing does not exhaust the list of possible ways by which future principals given the dual principal assignment will modify the role. The great naturalist, John Muir, speaking of the delicate ecological balance of nature, said, "You can't do just one thing." He meant that when you do one thing to the environment, other (sometimes unpredictable) results follow. In a similar manner, if the dual principalship is to become a permanent feature of the Seattle Schools, other results will follow, and often these will not be predictable.

The principal's role in student discipline is an example. Speculating about this aspect of the future, given the environment of a dual principalship, Jim Alexander suggested that less time would be devoted to discipline. The principal in such a position would have less time to understand "why" a student behaved in a particular way; the punishments would be more swift, and often more severe. He mentioned in his own experience that he had spanked more kids this year than last year.

Before leaving the topic, perhaps additional emphasis is necessary to underscore the fact that unanticipated outcomes will occur. Indicators have been cited in this study that the principal's general well-being has suffered somewhat. Different individuals acting in the role of principal will respond in different ways. However, the strain experienced in the Sand Point-Cedar Park experiment makes it clear that some adjustments will occur. Given the dual principal assignment over a ten year period, it is quite likely that some individuals would experience heart attack, ulcers, emotional or other physical breakdown. The principal's own family relationships may be severely strained. Individuals will see their roles in different ways, and varying interpretations of the job or of the situation will cause some to put different duties near the low end of the priority list. Duties seen as important by the School Board, or by the public may not be accomplished.

Some Components Essential to the Dual Principalship

Where and under what conditions may the dual principalship be a viable arrangement? Alexander suggests that this should happen only when similar programs exist in the two schools. For example, PRIMR and non-PRIMR schools would create some problem in paired schools. Reading programs based on the divided day would also be a problem when matched with the traditional school day. There are important differences between K-5 and K-6 schools, especially in the interest sixth graders have in student government. When schools are different on a number of these features, they should probably not be paired. Magnet schools which are essentially different in emphasis would not probably fare as well under the dual principalship.

Alexander suggests that the dual principalship have a superior secretary. The secretary becomes, in some instances, a vice-principal who must be

efficient, responsible, and make decisions. He urges that many of these decisions cannot be done in the classroom, for example, by a head teacher, since the decisions must be made right now.

Alexander suggests that there must be adequate clerical staff to supervise kids at all times. The two schools should not have paired librarians, he says; the librarians provide much needed flexibility in scheduling of teachers.

He adds that the program cannot succeed with a staff containing even a few marginal teachers (persons whose performance has put their future status in doubt). A dual principal simply does not have the time to monitor and evaluate performance at that level.

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
STAFF SURVEY
EXPERIMENTAL DUAL PRINCIPALSHIP EVALUATION

This questionnaire is being sent to all full-time employees at Cedar Park and Sand Point. Your opinions are important in evaluating the success of the Dual Principalship experiment.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please circle your response to each item.

SA = Strongly agree
A = Agree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly disagree

Please make comparisons between your experiences this year and last year, to the best of your ability. "This year" means September 1976 to February 1977. "Last year" means the corresponding period, a year ago. Space is provided between survey items for you to comment briefly, if you wish. If the question does not apply to you, leave the item blank.

1. Students in my classes have created more disruptions this year than last year as a result of the dual principalship.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	1
2. On the whole, students have not experienced more delay this year than last year in receiving necessary disciplinary attention.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	2
3. I have encountered more occasions this year where demanding parents have imposed on my teaching or preparation time.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	3
4. I believe our principal is showing more visible signs of fatigue and strain now than at this time a year ago.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	4
5. On the whole, I believe I have ample opportunity to discuss problems and share experiences with our principal.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	5
6. Students generally are able to identify the principal.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	6
7. The secretary's role in the administration of student discipline has increased this year.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	7
8. My role in the follow-up of student discipline situations is more demanding this year.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	8

9.	The principal's lessened availability for assistance in discipline this year is not a significant factor.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	9
10.	I currently have less time to spend directly on teaching than last year.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	10
11.	The lunchroom is adequately supervised, in general.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	11
12.	The playground is adequately supervised, in general.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	12
13.	The morale of the staff, as evidenced by its congeniality, dedication to serving student needs, and loyalty to the group has not been significantly impaired by the dual principalship.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	13
14.	It is good practice to designate someone to be responsible for the building, to make emergency decisions, etc., in the principal's absence.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	14
15.	Teachers and other staff understand clearly who is "responsible for the building" in the principal's absence.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	15
16.	I have observed situations of conflict in authority roles attributable to the dual principalship arrangement.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	16
17.	My principal has devoted a suitable amount of time to the evaluation of my job performance this year.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	17
18.	I believe the instructional program has been seriously affected by the dual principalship assignment this year.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	18
19.	The principal assumes the teaching role in classrooms on fewer occasions than last year.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	19
20.	The principal devotes less time this year to activities which promote the student's self-concept.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	20
21.	Students know when the principal is in the building, and they attempt forms of misbehavior during his absence which they would not attempt if he were present.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	21

22.	I feel less able than last year to cope with strangers who may come through the building.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	22
23.	I am experiencing more fatigue and strain presently than at this time last year as a result of the dual principalship arrangement.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	23
24.	I believe the principal communicates the needs of our school to downtown administration as well as or better than last year.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	24
25.	I prefer the dual principalship to school closure.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	25
26.	School: (1) Cedar Park (2) Sand Point	26. _____				

Please feel free to comment on any of the items above, or on other matters relating to the dual principalship.

February 1977
Research Office

APPENDIX II

Responses, Staff Questionnaire

In this section, the items from the questionnaire are quoted, and the responses from staff members at each school are given. For simplicity, the responses "strongly agree" and "agree" have been combined, and "strongly disagree" and "disagree" have been combined. The principal responded on two questionnaires, once for each school. In most instances his responses were identical, thus the number "2" appears after the word "principal." Where his responses were different for the two schools, the number "1" appears under "agree" and under "disagree," e.g., item 13.

All of the responses from staff members are tabulated here. Open comments given by the respondents are given in the next section.

Item 1. "Students in my classes have created more disruptions this year than last year as a result of the dual principalship."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	0	8
Sand Point	1	3
Principal	2	0

Item 2. "On the whole, students have not experienced more delay this year than last year in receiving necessary disciplinary attention.

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	3	9
Sand Point	1	4
Principal	0	2

Item 3. "I have encountered more occasions this year where demanding parents have imposed on my teaching or preparation time."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	2	7
Sand Point	3	1
Principal	2	0

Item 4. "I believe our principal is showing more visible signs of fatigue and strain now than at this time a year ago."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	2	1
Sand Point	7	1
Principal	2	0

Item 5. "On the whole, I believe I have ample opportunity to discuss problems and share experiences with our principal."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	4	8
Sand Point	4	3

Item 6. "Students generally are able to identify the principal."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	10	2
Sand Point	7	1
Principal	2	0

Item 7. "The secretary's role in the administration of student discipline has increased this year."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	12	0
Sand Point	8	0
Principal	2	0

Item 8. "My role in the follow-up of student discipline situations is more demanding this year."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	6	4
Sand Point	5	0
Principal	2	0

Item 9. "The principal's lessened availability for assistance in discipline this year is not a significant factor."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	0	12
Sand Point	1	5
Principal	0	2

Item 10. "I currently have less time to spend directly on teaching than last year."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	1	7
Sand Point	2	1

Item 11. "The lunchroom is adequately supervised, in general."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	9	2
Sand Point	7	1
Principal	2	0

Item 12 "The playground is adequately supervised, in general."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	10	1
Sand Point	7	1
Principal	2	0

Item 13. "The morale of the staff, as evidenced by its congeniality, dedication to serving student needs, and loyalty to the group has not been significantly impaired by the dual principalship."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	8	3
Sand Point	4	4
Principal	1	1

Item 14. "It is good practice to designate someone to be responsible for the building, to make emergency decisions, etc., in the principal's absence."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	9	1
Sand Point	7	0
Principal	2	0

Item 15 "Teachers and other staff understand clearly who is "responsible for the building" in the principal's absence."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	1	9
Sand Point	3	2
Principal	0	2

Item 16. "I have observed situations of conflict in authority roles attributable to the dual principalship arrangement."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	2	8
Sand Point	1	7
Principal	2	0

Item 17. "My principal has devoted a suitable amount of time to the evaluation of my job performance this year."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	8	2
Sand Point	5	2
Principal	2	0

Item 18. "I believe the instructional program has been seriously affected by the dual principalship assignment this year."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	3	6
Sand Point	4	1

Item 19. "The principal assumes the teaching role in classrooms on fewer occasions than last year."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	3	0
Sand Point	3	2
Principal	2	0

Item 20. "The principal devotes less time this year to activities which promote the student's self-concept."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	6	1
Sand Point	3	4
Principal	2	0

Item 21. "Students know when the principal is in the building, and they attempt forms of misbehavior during his absence which they would not attempt if he were present."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	4	7
Sand Point	1	7

Item 22. "I feel less able than last year to cope with strangers who may come through the building."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	1	8
Sand Point	1	5

Item 23. "I am experiencing more fatigue and strain presently than at this time last year as a result of the dual principalship arrangement."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	2	7
Sand Point	2	5

Item 24. "I believe the principal communicates the needs of our school to downtown administration as well as or better than last year."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	3	3
Sand Point	5	1
Principal	0	2

Item 25. "I prefer the dual principalship to school closure."

	Agree	Disagree
Cedar Park	10	2
Sand Point	5	2
Principal	1	1

Open Comments, Staff

"I feel Mr. Alexander has done an outstanding job of handling the dual principalship. He is readily available at all times for emergencies at either school. He is an excellent administrator and a good choice for dual principalship."

"Sand Point has problems unique to a small school. Over 1/3 of enrollment comes from 'deprived' homes; top economic and low slum student housing--both 'unattended,' 'non-supervised' children. Home taught citizenship left up to school."

"We don't have a male staff member in the building for boys to communicate with. Why not???"

"I really don't know how Mr. Alexander does it with most everything being double-duty. He has worked hard at trying to be in two places at one time, and that's impossible. I don't believe that an appointed "head teacher" is the answer either, unless that person is given at least half of the day to handle problems and doesn't have his/or her own class to take care of as well. I really don't know the answer to the problem, but it is a problem that needs to be resolved."

"That's like saying I prefer cancer over heart disease! They are both bad!" (responding to the closure vs. dual principalship question)

Some staff members declined to compare "visible signs of fatigue" over the two years, since a different principal was involved. Of course, the point is valid.

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ADMINISTRATIVE AND SERVICE CENTER • 815 Fourth Avenue North • Seattle, Washington 98109

February 2, 1977

Dear Parent:

This year, Sand Point and Cedar Park have operated under the administration of one principal. The dual principalship is an organizational change now being studied by the Seattle School District.

In order to evaluate this arrangement we would appreciate your answering the enclosed questionnaire and returning it as soon as possible in the envelope provided. Your responses will remain anonymous and confidential.

We appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

H. Reasby

Hal Reasby
Associate Superintendent

SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PARENT SURVEY
EXPERIMENTAL DUAL PRINCIPALSHIP EVALUATION

This questionnaire is being sent to a random sample of parents and to all PTSA Board members at Cedar Park and Sand Point. Your opinions are important in evaluating the success of the Dual Principalship experiment.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please circle your response to each item.

SA = Strongly agree
A = Agree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly disagree

If you do not have enough information to decide, leave the item blank. Please make comparisons between your experiences this year and last year, to the best of your ability. "This year" means September 1976 to February 1977. "Last year" means the corresponding period, a year ago. Space is provided between survey items for you to comment briefly, if you wish.

1.	On the whole, students have not experienced more delay this year than last year in receiving necessary disciplinary attention.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	1
2.	I believe our principal is showing more visible signs of fatigue and strain now than at this time a year ago.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	2
3.	On the whole, I believe I have ample opportunity to discuss problems with our principal.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	3
4.	Students generally know who the principal is.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	4
5.	The principal's lessened availability for assistance in discipline this year is not a significant factor.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	5
6.	The lunchroom is adequately supervised, in general.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	6
7.	The playground is adequately supervised, in general.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	7
8.	The morale of the staff, as evidenced by its congeniality, dedication to serving student needs, and loyalty to the group has not been significantly impaired by the dual principalship.	SA 1	A 2	D 3	SD 4	8

9. Teachers and other staff understand clearly who is "responsible for the building" in the principal's absence. SA A D SD 9
1 2 3 4

10. I believe the instructional program has been seriously affected by the dual principalship assignment this year. SA A D SD 10
1 2 3 4

11. I prefer the dual principalship to school closure. SA A D SD 11
1 2 3 4

12. School: (1) Cedar Park (2) Sand Point 12. _____

Please feel free to comment on any of the items above, or on other matters relating to the dual principalship.

February 1977
Research Office

Responses, Parent Questionnaire

Individual responses to each item in the parent questionnaire are given here. Open comments of parents are in the next section.

Item 1. "On the whole, students have not experienced more delay this year than last year in receiving necessary disciplinary attention."

	Agree	Disagree
Sand Point Board	3	6
Sand Point Parents	11	11
Cedar Park Board	3	2
Cedar Park Parents	20	3

Item 2. "I believe our principal is showing more visible signs of fatigue and strain now than at this time a year ago."

	Agree	Disagree
Sand Point Board	10	1
Sand Point Parents	18	6
Cedar Park Board	2	2
Cedar Park Parents	3	8

Item 3. "On the whole, I believe I have ample opportunity to discuss problems with our principal."

	Agree	Disagree
Sand Point Board	7	6
Sand Point Parents	29	8
Cedar Park Board	6	0
Cedar Park Parents	19	3

Item 4. "Students generally know who the principal is."

	Agree	Disagree
Sand Point Board	13	0
Sand Point Parents	37	1
Cedar Park Board	6	0
Cedar Park Parents	26	2

Item 5. "The principal's lessened availability for assistance in discipline this year is not a significant factor."

	Agree	Disagree
Sand Point Board	2	7
Sand Point Parents	16	13
Cedar Park Board	2	3
Cedar Park Parents	15	7

Item 6. "The lunchroom is adequately supervised, in general."

	Agree	Disagree
Sand Point Board	11	0
Sand Point Parents	27	2
Cedar Park Board	5	1
Cedar Park Parents	26	0

Item 7. "The playground is adequately supervised, in general."

	Agree	Disagree
Sand Point Board	11	0
Sand Point Parents	26	4
Cedar Park Board	5	1
Cedar Park Parents	25	2

Item 8. "The morale of the staff, as evidenced by its congeniality, dedication to serving student needs, and loyalty to the group has not been significantly impaired by the dual principalship."

	Agree	Disagree
Sand Point Board	5	6
Sand Point Parents	19	8
Cedar Park Board	4	1
Cedar Park Parents	19	5

Item 9. "Teachers and other staff understand clearly who is 'responsible for the building' in the principal's absence."

	Agree	Disagree
Sand Point Board	7	1
Sand Point Parents	20	1
Cedar Park Board	5	1
Cedar Park Parents	16	0

Item 10. "I believe the instructional program has been seriously affected by the dual principalship assignment this year."

	Agree	Disagree
Sand Point Board	9	4
Sand Point Parents	8	18
Cedar Park Board	1	5
Cedar Park Parents	2	21

Item 11. "I prefer the dual principalship to school closure."

	Agree	Disagree
Sand Point Board	9	1
Sand Point Parents	32	3
Cedar Park Board	6	0
Cedar Park Parents	27	1

Open Comments, Parents

"I feel Mr. Alexander has done as good a job as possible. He has been extremely conscientious and has tried very hard to do a great job at both schools, and treat both schools equally. However, I feel it is impossible for one person to do the job of two in the capacity of principal."

"I am very much against school closure and that is why on #11 I had to prefer dual principalship, but I am very much against that too."

"There is frustration at not being able to see him at my convenience or not knowing when. However, he's very good about making time."

"Mr. Alexander, an outstanding administrator, has done everything in his power to be as available to staff and parents as in past years; however, he has physically and mentally exhausted himself in the process."

"I have, on many occasions, seen Mr. Alexander's car at school until eleven at night. There are simply not enough hours in the day if the principal's responsibilities remain the same."

"When he is not in our building we are encouraged to phone him at Cedar Park."

"The quality of our children's education has suffered with each staff reduction but this has been the most serious to date. I feel it would be far preferable to have principals have additional administrative duties if necessary rather than dual principalship. Beyond that the strain is showing on Mr. Alexander. I feel that dual principalship is a nearly impossible job."

"He has an excellent office staff which is a help, but going from one school to another is wasting time."

"I believe it has been working out very well for Cedar Park School."

"I am not sure I even know the principal, as I am not at the school often and when I am there he seems to not be there. I believe Mr. Alexander is doing a good job, from what my children say, and would prefer the current status to closure, even though this is not ideal."

"Mr. Jim Alexander is such a superior principal, we are fortunate to have him."

"My daughter and her friends know the principal and are very fond of him and I think keeping the schools open is very important."

"The only problem I have encountered is catching him. Were it not for the secretary, who is so familiar with the school, parents and surrounding community--and were she less efficient, I do not feel the school would do as well under the dual situation."

I do not know who is responsible for the building, but I assume the staff knows. My guess is the secretary is responsible."

"I am comfortable with the instructional program of my children from K through 4th grades. I have found the teachers excellent, concerned about the students (at least my children), and most helpful and cooperative in the areas of learning problems. The reading program is excellent, and my second grader reads better than my 4th grader (both of which came into the program last year). The teachers I've dealt with the past year and this year in these grades are very dedicated to their jobs and educating children."

"Neither choice is acceptable!" (Dual principalship/closure)

"Dumb choice." (Dual principalship/closure)

"This is a ridiculous question! I prefer neither choice!" (Dual principalship/closure)

"I believe the school functions better with a full-time principal but I understand the financial constraints."

"I can no longer feel confident of a school I was once proud of."

"I am very much against this at our school again. There is no way that Mr. Alexander can be in two places at the same time. He has always been the most "approachable" principal we have ever seen but this year he hasn't been because of being in two schools--usually in the other one when you want him."

"Mr. Alexander is a superb principal and human being. He is exceptionally effective. I think the school has not suffered too much, but it certainly must be a significant strain on Mr. Alexander. Perhaps another pair of schools could have a dual principal next year."

"I have heard a much greater variety of complaints from much greater numbers of parents than in the past three years put together. I have known the entire staff to be extremely congenial with each other and others and putting out great effort to help each child to his best potential. This year many parents seem to be spending more and more time conferring with teachers over inabilities to complete or understand assignments and seeming to get very little responsive help to either parent or child. These are generally fair students and <u>not</u> your typical 'always gotta gripe against the schools and teachers' type of parents. Neither, I might add, am I. I've not spent as much time at school so far this year as in past years, but when I have been there I see a lot of things that distress me."

"Only because Mr. Alexander is such an outstanding person willing to put in many extra hours has it been possible for Sand Point to remain an outstanding school. We are also fortunate in having Mrs. Musselman, Mr. Kenyon and Mrs. Bolander who are very able people to supervise when he is at Cedar Park."

"I would not prefer to have a dual principalship as a general condition in Seattle schools, although in this case it has worked fairly well--but it must be an exhausting job for the principal!"

"In general, things have been going quite well. On a few occasions Mr. Alexander has not been available but I have usually been able to see him at a time very soon after."

"This survey is pure hogwash! The average parent would be unable to translate your buzz-words and be highly unlikely to know who the principal is, much less the kids!"

"Would prefer a full-time teaching principal, or a teaching vice principal with one-half time principal to the current arrangement. The principal is probably overworked. We have heard that the custodian sometimes handles discipline in the principal's absence!"

"Mr. Alexander is an exceptionally dedicated principal and responsible person. Perhaps, if Cedar Park had someone else this year, our school might not be in as good all-round condition as it is now."

"I feel that a principal has more than enough to do in one building. Our children realize that there is no principal in the building most of the time, and their actions show it."

"I feel that Mr. Alexander has done a superior job of being two places at once. He has usually been available to me when needed. However, I have doubts about the way most people would function under such demands."

"I feel that the students and staff have suffered as a result of Mr. Alexander's dual role; the strain resulting from this burden is showing throughout the school. I fear Mr. Alexander's health may be affected as well. An individual simply cannot be two places at once and availability seems to me to be a quality of major importance in an elementary school principal. It seems to me that additional administrative duties would be more preferable to a dual principalship. As noted in question 10, I still prefer a dual principalship to school closure, but I do not feel that any of our staffing can be further reduced and still provide a good education for our children."

"Dual principalship may be effective only where schools with small enrollment are concerned. The individual schools need to be considered."

"The dual principalship concept is a fine example of responding to 'fat' in the school system--reducing the administrative/instructional resource ratio."

"While discipline is an important problem the principal must deal with, I would hope that is not his primary role, as seems to be implied by the questions asked here. In order to evaluate how well the dual principalship is working I would want to know more about whether Mr. Alexander is able to provide leadership and encouragement to the teachers so that they do the best possible job for each student."

"Their opportunity to know the principal and work with him has been cut by 50% and vice versa. Our principal has done a tremendous job always and, as a result, maintains his role and the respect of those who know him."

"Like most parents, I haven't talked to Mr. Alexander except in general for a minute or two, so I really don't know if he's under a strain or overworked. It would appear to me he is not."

"I strongly agree with measures such as this during financially tight periods. One should always cut administrators before cutting classroom teachers."

"Mr. Alexander has been very helpful in dealing with problems we've had regarding our second grader. I feel very strongly that he's available and that he wants to work things out. He never appears too busy to help and follows up on his part amazingly well. We think he's an outstanding principal!"

"I personally would not recommend a principal take on a dual principalship. It is too much of a strain for anyone to have this kind of responsibility. Our principal, Jim Alexander, is a dedicated and remarkable man, and the feeling one has is that little has changed from last year in the running and atmosphere of the school. But this is entirely due to his conscientiousness and loyalty to both students, staff and parents. We are all concerned, though, of the effects of the stress and strain upon him and his family in running two schools at the high standards he rightly expects. We, at Sand Point, find ourselves in a difficult position. We do not want to see our school closed, but we do not want to impose what is essentially a double job on one man."

"Most of the above questions do not apply to my concern. The instruction remains excellent. The missing link has been between the school and the community. The school has taken on the image of functionary rather than a vital force supporting the family and community."

"Mr. Alexander has done an outstanding job. Dual principalship involves unusual motivation, and he has it. I doubt that there are many who would do nearly as well."

"I appreciate all the hard work and dedication Mr. Alexander has given Cedar Park. He is an outstanding man, and only someone of his ability could do the outstanding work he has done. However, I strongly feel children need to identify with a principal--not for authority only or discipline--but he can become a sort of friend when a school year is rough with a certain teacher. Grade schools need their Mr. Alexanders and Mr. Feeneys and Mr. Panzicas (retired) -- all superb men."

APPENDIX V

EVALUATION OF THE DUAL PRINCIPALSHIP

Prepared by Jim Alexander, Principal

In order to evaluate the dual principalship as fairly as possible, it is necessary to begin with some background about how this experiment was developed from the time it was decided in the spring of 1976 to pair two schools under one principal. Plans at that time called for such an experiment in the then Region I and another in Region II. Emerson and Rainier View were selected in South Seattle and Sand Point and Cedar Park were chosen for North Seattle. The Emerson-Rainier View section of the experiment was discontinued after a short time. I have understood that it was discontinued because of community pressure.

I want to make it clear from the beginning that I volunteered for the dual principalship and did so for the following reasons:

1. It only made good sense to have one of the then current principals of Cedar Park and Sand Point accept this new task since it would be quite unfair to require a completely new principal to become acquainted with both programs and then expect them to be effective to the point of valid evaluation in his or her new role. If the dual principalship were to succeed, it would seem that either Mr. Feeney or myself should accept the assignment for Region I.

2. I was just completing my fifth year at Sand Point and I felt that a new assignment would be good for me. It would force me to be more creative, a better manager, and allow me to compare first hand two school programs and how each served the needs of the students and the community.

3. The very idea of the dual principalship intrigued me and I wanted to see it either succeed or fail on its own merits. I did not want it to be predestined to fail because it was not given a chance for success. Nor did I want it to look as if it did succeed when in reality, it proved to be unsatisfactory as an approach to educating children.

I intend in this evaluation to show the effects of the dual principalship on the students, staff, community, and on me as a principal. It will also evaluate the administrative process.

Upon being selected as principal of two schools, I immediately asked for clarification of the position and for some support in areas that I felt were essential to success of the experiment.

I chose not to make use of a "head" teacher position as was done in the Emerson-Rainier View experiment. I felt that to select a head teacher at one building would relegate that school to the status of an annex and the chances for success

of the program in the community would be greatly lessened. I believe this decision proved to be a good one. Another reason for not selecting a head teacher was that it would be unfair for them to be asked to settle differences of opinion between staff members, especially when they had a stake in the outcomes.

I did ask for extra clerical help at both schools. I felt it was impossible for me to assume any playground or lunchtime duties and that it was necessary to have extra staff for this purpose. Also, the two schools were to share one librarian and I felt it highly desirable to keep the L.R.C. open when the librarian was at the other school. Cedar Park had a special problem in that the divided day is used to support the reading program. This meant that some primary students did not begin classroom work until 9:50 a.m., while others were dismissed from school at 1:40 in the afternoon. To make the divided day work, the school has in the past allowed students to come to school at 9:00 or to stay until 2:30. The purpose of this system was to care for children who would otherwise be left at home unattended because of working parents. The only place at the school where these children could be supervised has been the library. Staff was needed to supervise those students.

A three-hour clerk was assigned to Sand Point and a four-hour clerk assigned to Cedar Park. The extra hour at Cedar Park allowed us to continue the divided day program. In both cases the clerks were asked to supervise lunchrooms and to keep the libraries open. In addition, they corrected papers, typed, and completed tasks for teachers as time permitted.

I also asked that all itinerant staff be the same at both buildings. I made the request for the same person to teach instrumental music at both schools, the same speech therapist, the same nurse, and the same student service workers. I felt that it would give us better and more frequent communication if we could have more opportunity to make contact with each other. Only in the case of the nurse and the librarian was I able to have the same person serve both buildings.

Another major decision was with regard to my assigned time in each building. I decided that I must remain as flexible as possible and, therefore, I did not commit myself to a rigid time schedule to be in each school. Staffs were instructed to inform the secretary of a need to see me. She would then call me at the other building and I could drive from school to school in about ten minutes. I intended to spend at least some time in both schools each day. This system has been fairly effective in keeping me informed about the building and in giving staff the needed support they wish to have.

EFFECTS OF THE DUAL PRINCIPALSHIP

On Students

My relationship with students has changed considerably this year. I have always supervised the lunchroom in the past as a method of getting to know kids in non-academic situations. I have also attempted to maintain an open door policy for students. They found me available to help solve their problems by simply walking into my office. This also allowed me to get to know students better. Both the lunchroom supervision and the open door policy has for the most part been eliminated. I find that I know very few students at Cedar Park well enough to inquire about their personal interests. This is also a handicap in talking to parents about student problems. The situation is not quite as bad at Sand Point but that school does have an approximately 30 to 40 percent turn-over each year and as the year progresses, it is fast becoming a problem. There are times when staff would like to have me participate in discussions with students, especially in discipline cases. These usually occur just after recess or lunch breaks. Not being able to be at both schools at the same time I am unable to be of help. However, this has not been a problem of the magnitude I had expected.

On Staff

The staff has completed a survey from the Research Department and, in general, this should be satisfactory input from this source. I do have some impressions that I believe should be part of this report. I detect several feelings on the part of the staff. Some feel a definite frustration and I suspect some staff question the availability of support from the principal. They notice and have commented to me about the lessened time I have to be involved in class projects, and the personal interest I have previously taken in individual problems of certain children. I find a waiting line to see me whenever I come into the building. "Don't leave until I see you," has become a common phrase. Most of the requests to see me have been the result of the need for staff to communicate actions they have taken in making educational decisions, or to let me know that I may get a call about a child. In spite of their efforts we are often caught in an undesirable position because of poor communication. This is true from principal to staff and from staff to principal.

On Community

The community has also had an opportunity to respond through surveys sent out at random and a separate survey given to the P.T.A. Board. Here again, as with staff, I have some feelings about how the school and community relationships have been effected this year. I can only refer to Sand Point because of not having previous experience at Cedar Park. Parents at Sand Point have always required a good deal of the principal's time. They have been interested in the education of their

children. The community is somewhat split in how it wishes the school to associate with their children. Parents from the University of Washington student housing, in general, wish their children to be able to get along with others and wish the students to be able to have a part in making educational decisions. Social skills are very important to this group. Parents in the remainder of the community, in general, want a greater emphasis on basic skills and developing good study habits. It is sometimes difficult to satisfy both groups. I have received many more complaints this year about curriculum and staff than in any previous year. The complaints, in many cases, are valid to a degree, as they also have been in the past. This should not be construed as being critical of programs or staff but some decisions are going to be controversial when we deal with children and their complex problems. The frequency and severity of the complaints have been greatly increased. I believe many of the grievances became severe because I was unaware of the situation early enough, and sometimes because I was unavailable for immediate help to solve the problem.

On Administration and Management

Communication seems to be the biggest problem in administering two schools. To get the right information out to and from staff at the right time is difficult and time consuming. It requires two weekly staff bulletins which include surprisingly different information, and remembering what information should go into each bulletin is difficult to monitor.

I am required to prepare for two staff meetings. We were able to hold several joint meetings but each staff has their own special problems that need to be discussed and, therefore, dual staff meetings were rarely advisable.

It has also been difficult arranging times for staff meetings. Such things as end-of-quarter parent conferences, scope and sequence meetings, holidays, etc., have limited the opportunity for staff meetings.

My attendance at one District meeting requires two meetings to transfer that information to staff.

Reports required by the District must be filled out for both schools and most of the time the reports do not contain the same information, so separate research must be done. These reports are numerous and very time-consuming.

Levy coordination must be done for both schools. Again, working with different communities.

Two sets of consortium meetings must be attended. In spite of the fact that my time was taken in these meetings, I found them to be interesting in the way problems for the particular consortiums were solved. I learned a great deal from this arrangement.

Working with the District's goals set for principals has been extremely difficult and hard to meet the objective in both schools at the same time. Here the work load has nearly doubled. Many tasks are handled differently by the two staffs. This is especially true in District Goal 4 - "To manage and assure optimal use of District resources: management, personnel, financial and facilities."

I have also run into scheduling conflicts, especially in P.T.A. functions. Multiple P.T.A. board meetings, P.T.A. general meetings and activities can cause scheduling problems, especially when it is traditional that elementary schools schedule P.T.A. activities during the third week of the month in an effort to avoid conflict with secondary school programs.

In addition to the duties at two schools, I have acted as a coordinator for the School District in the area of traffic safety. This requires membership on a subcommittee of the City Council on School Safety, and acting as a liaison person between the schools, the District, the police department, city engineers and city councils. This school year to date I have coordinated a workshop for patrol supervisors under the auspices of S.P.I. and sponsored by them at my request. This position also requires a great deal of time to perform it properly. It was filled by a full-time person before the levy failed in 1975. The job also requires time out of the building, which in the case of dual principalship, simply cannot be tolerated.

I have found that sharing materials between the two schools is an advantage. It is certainly quicker than purchasing materials and, of course, is a financial savings.

I have learned better how to delegate authority, to prioritize the needs of a school, and most important, I have learned to solve problems in more than one way. The different approaches to problems at both schools has made me a better principal.

I have referred to the wide differences in programs at the two schools and it may help the Research Department if I name a few of these differences. Schools use different English texts. They use different spelling books. Cedar Park is on the divided day - Sand Point has the S.C.I.S. science program. Sand Point also has a strong music program with chorus activities. Cedar Park has a sixth grade. Sand Point goes to grade five. Cedar Park has a student council and student government. Sand Point is over 30 percent minority, while Cedar Park is mostly white. If the programs had more similarities it would be easier to manage them efficiently.

On Principal

The work load in the dual principalship is greater than at one school but the hours are not too much longer. I estimate that in past years I put in an average of nearly nine hours per day. I have, for the purposes of this report, kept an accurate accounting of my time and find that I average about ten hours per day at work. But I spend those hours in a different way than in the past, as was noted in my discussions about my relationships to students, staff and community.

It is a rare situation to find that I can take more than five minutes for lunch, and even during this time I find that I am conferencing with staff. Coffee breaks too are rare, and then again it is done in conference with staff. As I have stated earlier, I have learned to delegate work and authority. In most cases the one on the receiving end of this work load has been the secretaries of both schools. Without their skill and dedication the dual principalship would be doomed to complete failure. Attempting to pair two schools should never be tried without first determining whether or not the secretaries are of superior caliber. I was fortunate that this was the case at both schools.

I have spent many more sleepless nights this year. My blood pressure is up slightly and my eating habits are much poorer.

My family has suffered from my absence from home. For this reason alone I will ask that I be relieved of a second school for the 1977-78 school year. It is hypocritical of me to ask parents to spend some time being interested in their children and then to neglect my own family. I do not wish to be guilty of this omission again.

The mental strain has been considerable because I have had to deal mostly with negative situations and do not get to see the successes of working with children. I sorely miss the personal contact with students. It is probably this one aspect of educating children that has drawn all of us into this field. I have not felt success this year. My self-image as a principal has suffered.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I do not believe that I can recommend that the dual principalship be eliminated because of the single experience of one principal. I can recommend that it be discontinued between Cedar Park and Sand Point. Sand Point, because of its complex community and because of the need for teacher support with student discipline, should not be a paired school. The dual principalship is, in my mind, marginal at best, and to pair schools with time consuming problems is asking for failure.

Any paired schools in the future should include a sizable stipend for head secretaries. They are forced into making many decisions that are normally reserved for building principals. I should also like to reemphasize the need to be certain that only superior secretaries be considered for placement in paired schools.

It is questionable whether or not paired schools should also be involved in the paired librarian plan. Every school needs some flexibility. Both of these systems limit the kinds of activities that need to go on in a school.

Keeping small schools open is certainly a high priority in the communities but it may not be educationally sound. It would be better to close schools if paired principals, paired librarians, numerous split classes, skeleton programs, and inflexibility in staffing are the only ways to keep them open.

Prepared by J. Alexander
February 15, 1977